

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. Claims 1-11, 13, 16, 17, 19, 22, and 24 stand rejected and claims 12, 14, 18, 20, 21, and 23 are objected to. By this Amendment, claims 1-5, 7-13, 16, 18-19, and 22-24 have been amended. The amendments made to the claims do not alter the scope of these claims, nor have these amendments been made to define over the prior art. Rather, the amendments to the claims have been made to improve the form thereof. In light of the amendments and remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Applicant acknowledges the indication that the objected-to claims contain allowable subject matter but refrain from re-writing those claims in independent form until final resolution of the base claims from which they depend.

Applicant includes herewith a complete set of formal drawings. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-3, 10, 11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,984,817 ("Barbour"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Among the limitations of independent claim 1 not present in the cited references is a cache memory storing an IP table. Similarly, claim 10 recites a cache memory for storing a copy of a next-hop address that has been retrieved from the first memory. In Barbour, there is no disclosure of a cache memory which stores next-hop addresses as explicitly recited in independent claims 1 and 10. In Barbour,

a search table 106 contains most recently used program entries. As such, the Barbour reference does not disclose the routing system disclosed in Applicant's independent claims.

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action rejects claims 4-9, 16, 17, 19, 22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,553,002 ("Bermer") in view of Barbour. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or combine references to arrive at the claimed subject matter. The prior art references must also teach or suggest all the limitations of the claim in question. See, M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). A reference can only be used for what it clearly discloses or suggests. See In re Hummer, 113 U.S.P.Q. 66 (C.C.P.A. 1957); In re Stencel, 4 U.S.P.Q.2d 1071, 1073 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Here, the references, whether taken individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the invention claimed by the Applicant.

Bermer was not included to disclose the deficiencies in Barbour discussed above. Bermer was included to disclose additional limitations which, even if Barbour were to disclose, does not cure the deficiencies in Barbour discussed above. As such, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 4-9, 16, 17, 19, 22, and 24 are allowable over the cited references.

Applicant has responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: July 23, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By

Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicant

IRB/mgs